



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,622	06/28/2001	Dai Miyawaki	826.1733	4876
21171	7590	07/26/2006	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005				HUYNH, CONG LAC T
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/892,622	MIYAWAKI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Cong-Lac Huynh	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3,5-10,12,14-16,18,20-22,24 and 26-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1, 3, 5-10, 12, 14-16, 18, 20-22, 24, 26-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 3/29/06 to the application filed on 6/28/01, priority 6/28/00.
2. Claims 1, 3, 5-10, 12, 14-16, 18, 20-22, 24, 26-36 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 3, 10, 12, 16, 18, 22, 24, 28-30 are independent claims.

### ***Priority***

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 10, 16, 22, 28, 29 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson, *Bookmark Organiser Ready*, Electronic Engineering Times, July 31, 1995, pg. 140 (pgs 1-2 as printed from ProQuest).

Regarding independent claim 10, Johnson discloses:

- obtaining a dragging-and-dropping operation, and a copying-and-pasting operation of said various image data provided by the server which are displayed

on the Web browser in the client (**page 1, last paragraph**: "Along with WWW pages, images and text encountered on the Internet ...users can merely **drag-and-drop** WWW pages, images and text into the GrabNet window ... For other browsers, a **simple copy-and paste** accomplishes the same task"; drag-and drop and copy-and-paste operations can be obtained to apply on various image data provided by the server which are displayed on the web browser in the client, where one data using drag-and drop operation, and the other data using copy-and-paste operation)

- inserting into the application of the client by dragging and dropping or copying and pasting various image data provided by the server which are displayed on the Web browser in the client (**page 1**: "If used with a *Macintosh and Netscape*, users can merely **drag-and-drop** WWW pages, **images** and text *into the GrabNet window* to automatically transfer their universal-source-locator (URL) along with the image or text clippings. *For other browsers*, a simple **copy-and paste** accomplishes the same task"; drag and drop or copy and paste various images on the Internet on the web browser into the client window shows that the images are inserted into the client window)
- obtaining, together with various image data provided by the server which are displayed on the Web browser in the client, URLs in which various image data are published, and information relating to said various image data, and managing the information relating to said various image data as attributes of said various image data (**page 140**: "... users can merely drag-and-drop WWW pages,

**images and text into the GrabNet window to automatically transfer their universal-source-locator (URL) along with the image or text clippings ... In either case, the WWW page's title is used as the index entry within GrabNet ... The clipboard-to-folder icon adds the image or text on the clipboard to the open GrabNet window along with its originating URL"; transferring the URL along with the image implies that many URLs would be transferred along with various images; in other words, URLs are obtained with various image data; further since the WWW page's title is used as the index entry within GrabNet, the page's title plays a role as a control factor for managing the information relating to image data whenever the images are dropped in the GrabNet window)**

Claim 1 is for a system of method claim 10, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 16 is for a computer-readable storage medium of method claim 10, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 22 is for a program of method claim 10, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 28 is for a system of method claim 10, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 29, Johnson discloses:

- allowing a user to insert an image into an application (**page 1**: "If used with a Macintosh and Netscape, users can merely drag-and-drop WWW pages, images and text into the GrabNet window to automatically transfer their universal-source-locator (URL) along with the image or text clippings. For other browsers, a simple copy-and paste accomplishes the same task"; drag and drop images into the client window shows that the images are inserted into the client window)
- updating an image attribute in the application with a URL at which the image is available and with an image identification information relating to the image (**page 140**: "... users can merely drag-and-drop WWW pages, **images** and text into the GrabNet window to automatically transfer their universal-source-locator (URL) along with the image or text clippings ... In either case, the WWW page's title is used as the index entry within GrabNet ... The clipboard-to-folder icon adds the image or text on the clipboard to the open GrabNet window along with its originating URL"; transferring their URL *along with* the image shows that the image is updated with a URL at which the image is available compared with when transferring the image alone where the WWW page's title is considered identification information relating to the image since the title is information to identify the image)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 3, 5-6, 12, 14-15, 18, 20-21, 24, 26-27, 30-31, 34 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stierle, *BricsNet Acquires Leading Online Provider of Building Industry*, Business Wire, Oct 26, 1999, page 1 (pgs 1-3 as printed from ProQuest) in view of Cunningham, *Built for Existing Users not the First-Timer*, Computing Canada, August 5, 1997, vol. 23, Iss. 16, pg.28, 2 pgs (pages 1-3 as printed from ProQuest) and Puttre, *CAD vendors wrap engineers in the World Wide Web*, Design News, Feb 17, 1997, vol. 52, Iss. 4, pg. 58, 4 pgs (pages 1-5 as printed from ProQuest).

Regarding independent claim 12, Stierle discloses:

Art Unit: 2178

- obtaining a dragging-and-dropping operation of said various CAD parts data provided by the server which are displayed on the Web browser in the client (**page 2:** “.. BricsNet’s new architectural software for IntelliCAD and AutoCAD will enable users to insert specifications and CAD symbols from the Internet into their design via a drag-and-drop operation ...”)
- inserting the CAD parts data into the application of the client by dragging and dropping or copying and pasting the image data displayed on the Web browser in the client (**page 2:** “.. BricsNet’s new architectural software for IntelliCAD and AutoCAD will enable users to insert specifications and CAD symbols from the Internet into their design via a drag-and-drop operation ...”)

Stierle does not disclose obtaining a copying-and-pasting operation of various CAD parts data as applied to the dragging-and-dropping operation.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Stierle to include the copying-and-pasting operation since it is well known in the art to use the copying-and-pasting operation for modifying data.

Stierle also does not disclose obtaining, together with the various CAD parts data provided by the server which are displayed on the Web browser in the client, URLs in which said various CAD parts data are published and information relating to said various CAD parts data as attributes of said various CAD parts data.

Cunningham discloses that the CAD drawings, when saved in DWF (Drawing Web Format), can be posted to a web page with the URLs attached to the drawings (**page 2:**

*“.. By saving drawings in DWF (Drawing Web Format), you can post them to a Web page where they can be viewed with a plug-in. URLs can also be attached to your drawings ..”). Cunningham does not disclose information relating to said various CAD parts data as attributes of the CAD parts data.*

Puttre provides hot links that a user can navigate graphically by clicking on a desired balloon for further displaying the detailed drawings (page 3). This shows that the hot links which include URLs and the balloons representing information of the detailed parts of the drawings, which are equivalent to the CAD parts, are managed so that the CAD parts can be displayed according to a user’s request via clicking action.

It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Puttre into Cunningham into Stierle for the following reason. Puttre discloses managing the hot links of the detailed parts of a drawing so that said parts can be displayed as user’s desire via clicking providing the advantage to incorporate into Cunningham and Stierle for effectively managing not only the CAD image but also the CAD parts, which are the detailed parts of the image, to provide users with useful detailed images.

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent on claim 12, Stierle discloses that when the CAD parts data is dropped or pasted from the Web browser, the data is automatically converted into a CAD application format of the client and then inserted (page 1: “..  
*BricsNet’s new architectural software for InteliCAD and AutoCAD will enable users to insert specifications and CAD symbols from the Internet into their design via a drag-and-*

*drop operation ..."; the fact that users can insert CAD symbols from the Internet into their design via a drag-and-drop operation inherently shows that the CAD data is automatically converted into a CAD application format of the client before inserting since it is clear that their design is in AutoCAD application).*

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent on claim 12, Stierle does not disclose referring to an original Web pages based on a URL managed as an attribute of the parts data inserted into the CAD application.

Cunningham discloses posting the CAD drawings in web format to the Internet with their attached URLs (page 2).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Cunningham into Stierle for the following reason. The fact that Cunningham discloses posting the CAD drawings with their URLs to the Internet suggests that the URLs can be used as the attributes of the CAD drawings to *refer to the original Web page* where the CAD drawings are posted. This provides the advantage to incorporate into Stierle for easily tracking the original of the CAD data when exporting the CAD data to the Internet or dropping the CAD data from the Internet to any application at client.

Claims 3, 5-6 are for a system of method claims 12, 14-15, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 18 and 24 are for a computer readable medium and a program of method claim 12, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 20 and 26 are for a computer readable medium and a program of method claim 14, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 21 and 27 are for a computer readable medium and a program of method claim 15, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 30, Stierle discloses:

- allowing a user to insert a CAD part and part image into a CAD application (**page 2**: “*.. BricsNet’s new architectural software for InteliCAD and AutoCAD will enable users to insert specifications and CAD symbols from the Internet into their design via a drag-and-drop operation ...*”)

Stierle does not disclose:

- updating a CAD attribute of the CAD part in the CAD application with a URL at which the CAD part and part image are available and with CAD part identification information relating to the CAD part

Cunningham discloses that the CAD drawings, when saved in DWF (Drawing Web Format), can be posted to a web page with the URLs attached to the drawings (**page 2**: “*.. By saving drawings in DWF (Drawing Web Format), you can post them to a Web page where they can be viewed with a plug-in. URLs can also be attached to your drawings ..*”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Cunningham into Stierle for the following reason. Cunningham discloses saving and posting the CAD drawings in the Internet with their URLs providing the advantage to incorporate into Stierle for updating a CAD attribute of a CAD part in the CAD application with a URL at which the CAD part and part image are available and with CAD part identification relating to the CAD part since inserting specifications of the CAD part via dragging and dropping would change the CAD attribute of the CAD part and image.

Regarding claim 31, which is dependent on claim 3, Stierle does not disclose that the URL is added automatically.

Cunningham discloses that the URL is added automatically (**page 2**: “.. By saving drawings in DWF (Drawing Web Format), you can post them to a Web page where they can be viewed with a plug-in. *URLs can also be attached to your drawings ..*”; this shows that the URL is added to the drawing automatically when the drawing is posted). It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Cunningham into Stierle since Cunningham discloses attaching URL to drawings posted on the Internet providing the advantage to incorporate into Stierle for easily recognizing the website containing the posted drawing and conveniently retrieving related drawings if needed.

Regarding claim 34, which is dependent on claim 3, Stierle and Cunningham do not disclose explicitly:

- discarding the CAD parts data when use of the application is finished
- using the URL to obtain the CAD parts data as needed for subsequent uses of the application

Puttre discloses hot links associated with the CAD parts of a CAD image (page 3) where the URLs included in the hot links are addresses for accessing and retrieving the corresponding CAD parts.

It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Puttre into Cunningham and Stierle since Puttre teaches the hot links including the URLs corresponding to the CAD parts providing the advantage to incorporate into the URL of the CAD image in Cunningham and Stierle for further obtaining the CAD parts data by simply accessing the provided URLs of the CAD parts.

Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Stierle, Cunningham and Puttre to include discarding the CAD parts data when use of application is finished since it was well known in the art to delete data not in use for saving memory as well as speeding the application process.

9. Claim 7 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stierle and Cunningham as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Puttre, *CAD*

*vendors wrap engineers in the World Wide Web*, Design News, Feb 17, 1997, vol. 52, Iss. 4, pg. 58, 4 pgs (pages 1-5 as printed from ProQuest).

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 3, Stierle and Cunningham do not disclose generating a URL list from a URL managed as an attribute of plural pieces of CAD parts data inserted into the CAD application.

Puttre discloses that a file created in the Computer Graphics Metafile (CGM) might have hot links that the user can navigate graphically by clicking on a desired balloon for further displaying the detailed drawings (page 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Puttre to include generating a URL list from a URL managed as an attribute of plural pieces of CAD parts data displayed on the Web for the following reason. Puttre discloses that a CAD drawing might have hot links represented by the balloons so that a user can click on these balloons for retrieving the display of the detailed drawing. This suggests that the hot links of the detailed drawings be in the list of URLs that includes the URL of the main CAD drawing since the detailed drawings and the main CAD drawing are from a same web page. In other words, Puttre suggests a URL list generated from a URL managed as an attribute of plural pieces of CAD parts data.

Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Puttre into Stierle and Cunningham since Puttre suggests a list of URL from a URL managed as an attribute of plural pieces of CAD

parts data providing the advantage to incorporate into Stierle and Cunningham for inserting plural pieces of CAD parts data with their URLs into client via dragging and dropping operation.

10. Claims 32-33 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stierle and Cunningham as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Puttre, *CAD vendors wrap engineers in the World Wide Web*, Design News, Feb 17, 1997, vol. 52, Iss. 4, pg. 58, 4 pgs (pages 1-5 as printed from ProQuest).

Regarding claim 32, which is dependent on claim 3, Stierle and Cunningham do not disclose that the URL and information are managed as a list of attributes of the CAD parts data.

Puttre discloses that a file created in the Computer Graphics Metafile (CGM) might have hot links that the user can navigate graphically by clicking on a desired balloon for further displaying the detailed drawings (page 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Puttre to include managing the URL and information as a list of attributes of the CAD parts data for the following reason. Puttre discloses clicking on a selected hot link represented by a balloon included in the CAD drawing to retrieve a desired drawing detail shows that the URL and the name of the hot link or balloon for each drawing detail are managed as attributes of the CAD parts data to be displayed to users. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention was made to have combined Puttre into Stierle and Cunningham for conveniently accessing and retrieving only CAD parts needed instead of retrieving and downloading the whole CAD image, which takes unnecessary spaces in transmitting as well as storing.

Regarding claim 33, which is dependent on claim 3, Stierle and Cunningham do not disclose that the attributes include the URL and a title of the page at the URL. Puttre discloses that a file created in the Computer Graphics Metafile (CGM) might have hot links that the user can navigate graphically by clicking on a desired balloon for further displaying the detailed drawings (page 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Puttre to include the URL and a title of the page at the URL since the hot links name and the URL associated with the hot link are considered as attributes of an instant CAD part of a CAD drawing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Puttre into Stierle and Cunningham for quickly accessing and retrieving only CAD parts needed instead of retrieving the whole CAD image, which takes unnecessary spaces in transmitting as well as storing.

Regarding claim 36, which is dependent on claim 3, Stierle and Cunningham do not disclose that the image is comprised of a plurality of parts each associated with a separate URL.

Puttre discloses that a file created in the Computer Graphics Metafile (CGM) might have hot links that the user can navigate graphically by clicking on a desired balloon for further displaying the detailed drawings (page 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Puttre to include a plurality of CAD parts each associated with a separate URL for the following reason. Puttre discloses that a CAD drawing might have hot links represented by the balloons so that a user can click on these balloons for retrieving the display of the detailed drawing. This suggests that the drawing details be CAD parts with associated hot links, which are associated URLs. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Puttre into Stierle and Cunningham since Puttre discloses plural pieces of CAD parts with associated hot links providing the advantage to incorporate into Stierle and Cunningham for conveniently accessing and retrieving only CAD parts needed instead of retrieving the whole CAD image, which takes unnecessary spaces in transmitting as well as storing.

11. Claim 8 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stierle, Cunningham, and Puttre as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Smith, Collaborate on the Web, CADalyst, Feb 1999, vol. 16, Iss. 2, pg. 58, 6 pgs (pages 1-8 as printed from ProQuest).

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Stierle, Cunningham, and Puttre do not disclose obtaining update information about a Web page corresponding to each URL of the URL list, and notifying a user of the information.

Smith discloses a Web collaboration tools for CAD users by providing a virtual work site where the users can share and discuss designs, revisions, and project documents via the Internet as well as keep track design changes (pages 1, 4). Smith further discloses showing changes made to drawings on the meeting held over the Web with simultaneous discussion (page 2). Smith also discloses sending email notification for specific event and use instant messaging for approval and revision request (page 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Smith into Stierle, Cunningham, and Puttre for the following reason. The fact that Smith discloses showing changes made to drawings suggests updating information about a web page corresponding to each URL in the URL list since each part of the drawings has a corresponding URL and thus, updating the drawings leads to updating the information about the corresponding web page. Also, the fact that Smith discloses using email for notifying specific event suggests notifying the updated information to users in addition to notifying specific event to users via email. The combination of Smith into Stierle, Cunningham, and Puttre would help fast updating engineering information in the Internet as well as fast notifying the updated information to users.

12. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stierle, Cunningham, and Puttre as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Smith, Collaborate on the Web, CADalyst, Feb 1999, vol. 16, Iss. 2, pg. 58, 6 pgs (pages 1-8 as printed from ProQuest).

Regarding claim 35, which is dependent on claim 3, Stierle and Cunningham do not disclose updating the URL and other information associated with a drawing. Smith discloses a Web collaboration tools for CAD users by providing a virtual work site where the users can share and discuss designs, *revisions*, and project documents via the Internet as well as keep track design changes (pages 1, 4). Smith further discloses showing changes made to drawings on the meeting held over the Web with simultaneous discussion (page 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Smith into Stierle, Cunningham, and Puttre for the following reason. The fact that Smith discloses showing *changes made to drawings* with *simultaneous discussion* implies that updating CAD image corresponding to each URL and other information associated with the CAD drawings is performed. The combination of Smith into Stierle, Cunningham, and Puttre would help fast updating CAD drawings as well as related CAD information in the Internet to provide the newest CAD information to users.

13. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stierle and Cunningham as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Smith, Collaborate on the Web, CADalyst, Feb 1999, vol. 16, Iss. 2, pg. 58, 6 pgs (pages 1-8 as printed from ProQuest).

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 3, Stierle and Cunningham do not disclose obtaining updated information on a Web page corresponding to the inserted CAD parts data using a URL managed as an attribute of the inserted CAD parts data, and reflecting a change of information about the inserted CAD parts data.

Smith provides a virtual work site where the users can share and discuss designs, revisions, and project documents via the Internet as well as keep track design changes (pages 1, 4). Smith further discloses showing changes made to drawings on the meeting held over the Web with simultaneous discussion (page 2). Smith also discloses sending email notification for specific event and use instant messaging for approval and revision request (page 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Smith into Stierle and Cunningham for the following reason. The fact that Smith provides revisions and design changes via the Internet suggests updating the information of the web page containing the designs and reflecting the change of information about the CAD drawings on the Internet. This also suggests that changes to CAD drawings should be shown when the CAD drawings are dropped to the client. The combination of Smith into Stierle and Cunningham would help fast

updating engineering information in the Internet and fast notifying the updated information to users.

***Response to Arguments***

14. Applicant's arguments filed 3/29/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1, 10, 16, 22, 28, Applicants argue that Johnson neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "obtaining, together with various image data provided by the server which are displayed on the Web browser in the client, URLs in which various image data are published and information relating to said various image data, and managing the information relating to said various image data as attributes of said various image data" as recited (Remarks, page 9).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Johnson discloses images displayed on the Internet of the web browser (page 1) where the image is dragged-and-dropped or copied and pasted along with a URL. This suggests that the images, when dragged-and-dropped or copied and pasted would go along with the URLs. Further, since the WWW page's title is used as the *index entry* within GrabNet, the page's title plays a role as a control factor for managing the information relating to image data whenever the images are dropped in the GrabNet window. Thus, Johnson does teach the obtaining and managing as claimed.

Regarding independent claim 29, Applicants argue that Johnson does not disclose "updating an image attribute in the application with a URL at which the image is

available and with image identification information relating to the image" since the URL is considered identification information relating to the image, and thus, "cannot also meet the recitation "image identification information relating to the image." Further, using WWW page's title as the index entry is simply tracing the origin of the image with the URL, not "updating an image attribute ..." as claimed (Remarks, page 10).

In response to the argument, it is noted that the claimed limitation requires "updating an image attribute in the application with a URL at which ..." The image, when dropped or pasted in the application, is inserted into the application. If the image is inserted in conjunction with its associated URL, then the image is considered being updated with a URL at which the image is originally posted. The WWW page's title as well as the URL can be the "image identification information" since both are information to identify the image. Therefore, Johnson in the cited page, meets the claimed limitation.

Regarding claims 3, 5-6, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20-21, 24, 26-27, 31-34, and 36, Applicants argue that Stierle, Cunningham and Puttre do not teach, disclose, or suggest "obtaining, together with the various CAD parts data provided by the server which are displayed on the Web browser in the client, URLs in which said various CAD parts data are published and information relating to said various CAD parts as attributes of said various CAD parts data" as recited. The reason is that Puttre describes posting CAD images on the Internet, the flow of information is opposite to that of the claimed invention and the "hot link" in Puttre appears to be a regular file link, not a URL (Remarks, page 12). Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As mentioned in the office action, Cunningham discloses “obtaining, together with the various CAD parts data provided by the server which are displayed on the Web browser in the client, URLs in which said various CAD parts data are published and information relating to said various CAD parts as attributes of said various CAD parts data” as recited since the URL can be attached to the drawings when the drawings are saved in Drawing Web Format and posted on a web page (office action, page 7). Further, the “hot links” in Puttre are well known the hyperlinks linking to the URLs, the addresses of the resources in the Internet. Therefore, the hot links in Puttre indirectly implies to the URLs.

Regarding claim 30, Applicants argue that Stierle, Cunningham, and Puttre do not disclose “updating a CAD part attribute of the CAD part in the CAD application with a URL at which the CAD part and part image data are available and with CAD part identification information relating to the CAD part”. The reason is that the Office Action acknowledges that Cunningham does not disclose, “managing the URL and information as attributes of the CAD part data,” so Cunningham must not be updating “a CAD part attribute of the CAD part in the CAD application with a URL at which the CAD part and part image are available and with CAD part identification information relating to the CAD part,” (Remarks, page 12).

Examiner agrees that Cunningham does not disclose, “managing the URL and information as attributes of the CAD part data.” However, Cunningham does teach saving the CAD drawings with their URLs and posting the CAD drawings in the Internet

(see office action, page 10). Saving the CAD drawings along with their URLs is one way of updating the saving of CAD drawings alone. Thus, Cunningham discloses the claimed limitations as required.

***Conclusion***

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kikinis (US 5,929,849, filed 5/2/96).

Brown et al. (US 6,278,448, filed 02/17/98).

Hasegawa (US 6,262,731, filed 07/22/98).

Barrus et al. (US 6,693,652, filed 09/26/00).

Diamond et al. (US 6,591,295, filed 11/5/99).

Land et al. (US 7,051,019, filed 8/17/99).

Land et al. (US 2006/0080306, priority 8/17/99).

Hepworth et al. (US 2002/0143814, priority 3/21/01).

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-4125.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cong-Lac Huynh  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2178  
07/13/06